



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,546	10/29/2002	Steven Neiman	36287-03400	7678
27171 7590 05/08/2009 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY 1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413				
EXAMINER WALERIC CHARLES				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2195				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,546

Applicant(s)

NEIMAN ET AL.

Examiner

ERIC C. WAI

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-22, 26-43, 46-56, 60-62 and 64-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-22, 26-43, 46-56, 60-62, and 64-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2-22, 26-43, 46-56, 60-62, and 64-79 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-3, 22, 26-28, 35-36, 38-43, 46-47, 55-56, 60-62, 70-71, and 73-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajkumar (US PG Pub No. US 2003/0061260 A1) in view of Buyya et al. ("A Case for Economy Grid Architecture for Service Oriented Grid Computing", Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium., Proceedings 15th International 23-27, April 2001, pgs 776-790,), in view of Ahamed et al. (US Pat No. 5,978,831), further in view of Tayyar et al. (US Pat No. 7,194,741).

4. Regarding claim 39, Rajkumar discloses a method, comprising:
receiving one or more reservations for use of at least a first subset of a plurality of computing resources of a distributed computing system, wherein each of said one or more reservations specifies a period of time for use of said computing resources (abstract lines 4-5 and 8-9);

allocating said first subset of said computing resources for use in accordance with said one or more reservations (abstract lines 14-17, wherein the "reservation activities" run at a higher priority);

receiving one or more requests for use of at least a second subset of said plurality of computing resources of said distributed computing system, wherein each of said one or more requests specifies a period of time for use of said computing resources (abstract lines 9-12 and [0025]);

determining whether a sufficient amount of one or more unallocated computing resources are available, wherein said one or more unallocated computing resources comprises said computing resources of said distributed computing system that are not allocated in accordance with said one or more reservations ([0023] lines 8-9);

responsive to said sufficient amount of said unallocated computing resources being available, allocating said unallocated computing resources in accordance with said one or more requests ([0023] lines 8-9); and

responsive to said sufficient amount of said unallocated computing resources not being available, allocating said unallocated computing resources in accordance with an allocation criteria ([0024] lines 1-7).

5. While, Rajkumar does not explicitly teach the step of determining whether a sufficient amount of unallocated computing resources are available to fulfill all of said one or more requests, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included this limitation. Rajkumar's method has the

same end result of allocating resources to satisfy the requesting tasks as much as possible. Furthermore, Rajkumar does not explicitly teach that the method is to be used on a distributed computer system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a distributed computer in Rajkumar's invention. One would be motivated by the desire to increase the throughput and scalability of Rajkumar's invention.

6. Rajkumar does not teach that each reservation and request has a corresponding monetary cost to a user, and charging the user the monetary cost for use of the computing resources.

7. Buyya teaches a computational economy for use in a grid computing system that allows producers and consumers to negotiate costs for resources (abstract, and pg 1 column 2 paragraph 2). Buyya teaches multiple models where resource providers set a price through a posted price or bargaining model that is dynamic or static in nature (pg 3 column 2 paragraph 3). Buyya teaches that such an economy results in resource providers obtaining the best possible return on their investment by maximizing their resource utilization and profit (pg 2 column 2 paragraph 2).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rajkumar to include Buyya's teachings in order to implement a computational economy. One would be motivated by the desire to increase revenue as a result of competition as described by Buyya.

9. Rajkumar also does not teach that said plurality of computing resources comprises: a first type of processing device having a first processing capability; and a second type of processing device having a second processing capability, wherein said first and second processing capabilities are different.

10. Ahamed teaches mixing and matching processors of different speeds in order to create a system with reduced cost (col 3 lines 3-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a distributed computer system composed of processors of differing processing capabilities in order to reduce system costs.

11. Rajkumar also does not teach that each of said one or more reservations specifies an amount for use said first and second types of processing device in a normalized unit of processing capability.

12. It is old and well known to normalize values to simply values such as indicated Tayyar (col 3 lines 37-38, 52-56). Since the combination of Rajkumar and Ahamed results in a system having different processor sets with different capabilities, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to normalize the reservation values to simply the combination of Rajkumar and Ahamed.

13. Regarding claim 2, Rajkumar teaches modifying an amount of said plurality of computing resources of said distributed computing system based on consideration of said one or more reservations ([0024] lines 3-7).

14. Regarding claim 3, Rajkumar and Buyya do not explicitly teach adding a computing resource while said distributed computing system is in use.

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include adding a computing resource while the system is in use. One would be motivated by the desire to ensure that additional resources can still be allocated even if all the currently available resources are saturated.

16. Regarding claim 22, Rajkumar teaches that said plurality of computing resources comprises a processing device ([0048] line 2).

17. Regarding claim 26, Rajkumar and Buyya do not teach charging a user for canceling a reservation.

18. However it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include charging a user for the cancellation. Official notice is made that it is well known to charge a user for canceling a reservation. One would be motivated by the desire to penalize users for the cancellation of a resource because of the possibility that the resource would remain unutilized and no income was being generated from the idle resource.

19. Regarding claim 27, Rajkumar teaches that said plurality of computing resources comprises a memory device ([0048] line 5).

20. Regarding claim 28, Rajkumar teaches that said plurality of computing resources further comprises a processing device ([0048] line 2).

21. Regarding claim 35, Rajkumar teaches that one or more requests each comprise a priority indication, and wherein said allocation criteria considers said priority indication of each said request (abstract lines 9-12).

22. Regarding claim 36, Rajkumar teach that said allocation criteria comprises a calculation of a weighted average based at least in part on said priority indications ([0020] lines 16-18).

23. Regarding claim 38, Rajkumar teaches that the allocation criteria comprises an equal division of said unallocated computing resources between a plurality of users that have made a request ([0023-0024], wherein fixed priority activities having the same priority would be given an equal division of the resources).

24. Regarding claims 40, Rajkumar and Buyya do not explicitly teach that said allocation criteria comprises fulfilling said requests beginning with said request

comprising a highest bid indication and continuing in descending order of requests comprising said bid indications of lesser values until all of said unallocated resources have been allocated.

25. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform the fulfilling of requests in this manner. A skilled artisan would have known to place greater priority on higher bids by granting the associated requests first and continuing in a descending order of requests comprising bid indications of lesser values. One would be motivated by the desire to turn a higher profit by accepting the highest bids first.

26. Regarding claims 41, Rajkumar teaches that the unallocated computing resources are allocated dynamically ([0051] lines 2-3).

27. Regarding claim 42, Rajkumar and Buyya do not explicitly teach re-allocating said unallocated computing resources dynamically.

28. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include reallocation. While not mentioned explicitly by Rajkumar, such a process is implied since Rajkumar's system is intended to continuously allocate resources as they are freed and new tasks come in.

29. Regarding claim 43, Rajkumar teaches that the unallocated computing resources are allocated in real time in response to receiving said one or more requests (claim 2).

30. Regarding claim 46, Rajkumar teaches that said computing device comprises a server ([0048]).

31. Regarding claim 47, Rajkumar and Buyya do not teach that said computing device comprises at least two servers, wherein each server is in a different geographic location.

32. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include two servers in separate geographic locations. One would be motivated by the desire to protect against system failure by using load balancing and redundancy.

33. Regarding claim 55, Rajkumar teaches that a persistent data storage queue in communication with said computing resources, and wherein a minimum availability of said distributed computing system is defined by an availability of said persistent data storage queue ([0007]).

34. Regarding claim 78, Buyya teaches wherein one or more requests each comprise a monetary bid indication, and wherein said allocation criteria considers said monetary bid indication of each said request (pg 3 column 2 paragraphs 2 and 4, "bid-based proportional resource sharing model").

35. Regarding claims 56, 60-62, 70-71, 73-77, and 79, they are the system claims of claims 22, 26-28, 35-36, 38, 41, 43, and 78 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 22, 26-28, 35-36, 38, 41, 43, and 78.

36. Claims 4-21, 29-34, 37, 48-54, 64-69, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajkumar (US PG Pub No. US 2003/0061260 A1), Buyya et al. ("A Case for Economy Grid Architecture for Service Oriented Grid Computing", Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium., Proceedings 15th International 23-27, April 2001, pgs 776-790), Ahamed et al. (US Pat No. 5,978,831), and Tayyar et al. (US Pat No. 7,194,741), further in view of Schweitzer et al. (US Pat No. 6,418,467 hereinafter Schweitzer).

37. Schweitzer was disclosed on IDS dated 1/12/2004.

38. Regarding claim 4, Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar do not teach monitoring a usage level for at least a portion of said computing resources of said distributed computing system.

39. Schweitzer describes a method for network accounting and billing based on usage data (abstract and col 1 lines 56-67 to col 2 lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included monitoring a usage level in order to correctly bill customers.

40. Regarding claim 5, Schweitzer teaches providing data descriptive of said usage level (col 2 lines 19-27).

41. Regarding claim 6, Schweitzer teaches providing data descriptive of said usage level is performed in real time (col 3 lines 65-67).

42. Regarding claim 7, Schweitzer teaches using a graphical user interface to display said data descriptive of said usage level (col 4 lines 8-9 and 17-18).

43. Regarding claim 8, Schweitzer teaches that said usage level comprises a present usage of said plurality of computing devices (col 4 lines 1-2).

44. Regarding claim 9, Schweitzer teaches that said usage level comprises a historical usage of said plurality of computing devices (col 3 lines 43-49).

45. Regarding claims 10-15, Schweitzer does not teach monitoring an allocation of the computer resources. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor the allocation of resources for purposes of billing. Since allocation is equivalent to usage, claims 10-15 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-9.

46. Regarding claims 16-21, Schweitzer does not teach monitoring an inventory of the computer resources. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor the inventory of resources for purposes of billing. Since inventory is equivalent to allocation, claims 16-21 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 10-15.

47. Regarding claim 29, Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar do not teach billing a user of said computing resources.

48. Schweitzer describes a method for network accounting and billing (abstract and col 1 lines 56-67 to col 2 lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included billing a user for using computer resources in order to gain a profit.

49. Regarding claim 30, Schweitzer teaches that billing comprises determining whether a first price or a second price is to be billed (col 3 lines 24-25, "set the right price").

50. Regarding claim 31, Schweitzer does not explicitly teach that the first price comprises a peak price.

51. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a peak price to be charged during high utilization. One would be motivated by the desire to ensure a higher return of profit when multiple users are vying for resources.

52. Regarding claims 32-33, Schweitzer does not explicitly teach that said first price comprises an off-peak price or that said second price comprises a peak price.

53. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a peak price to be charged during high utilization and an off-peak price to be charged during low utilization. One would be motivated by the desire to ensure a higher return of profit when multiple users are vying for resources.

54. Regarding claim 34, Schweitzer does not explicitly teach that said first price is billed for said computing resources allocated in response to said reservation and said second price is billed for computing resources allocated in response to said request, wherein said first price is higher than said second price.

55. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to bill differently for a reservation and a request. Since reservations guarantee the allocation of a resource, one would be motivated by the desire to turn a higher profit by charging a higher premium.

56. Regarding claim 37, Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, Tayyar, and Schweitzer do not teach billing a user of said computing resources such that a cost varies in accordance with said priority indication.

57. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include doing so since a higher priority indication results in a higher

guarantee of resource allocation. Thus, one would be motivated to turn a higher profit by charging a higher premium for such a guarantee.

58. Regarding claims 48-53, they are the system claims of claims 6-7, 12-13, and 18-19 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-7, 12-13, and 18-19.

59. Regarding claim 54, Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar do not explicitly teach that said computing device is further configured to generate a billing record based on a usage level of said plurality of computing resource.

60. Schweitzer teaches generating a billing record based on a usage level of said plurality of computing resource (col 3 lines 32-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rajkumar and Buyya to include generating a billing record. One would be motivated by the desire to track resource utilization and perform record keeping.

61. Regarding claims 64-69, and 72, they are the system claims of claims 29-34, and 37 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 29-34, and 37.

Response to Arguments

62. Applicant's arguments filed 02/20/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

63. Regarding Rajkumar, Applicant argues on pg 19 of Remarks:

"However, as stated in independent claims 39 and 74, "requests" are allocated based on "period of time for use" of resources and "corresponding ... monetary cost to a user" of the resources. As a result, Rajkumar at least does not disclose "responsive to said amount of said unallocated computing resources being available, allocating said unallocated computing resources in accordance with said one or more requests"."

64. Examiner disagrees. Rajkumar is directed towards the allocation of resources between tasks that grouped into two categories: reservation and fixed priority. Rajkumar refers to the requests of the claims as tasks since it is inherent that tasks issue requests for resources (i.e. CPU, memory resources). Rajkumar clearly allocates any leftover resources to the fixed priority tasks after all reservations have been filled ([0024], wherein fixed priority activities are never permitted to monopolize the available resources so that reservation activities may always be granted some access to the available resources, i.e. reservations are filled, and available resources are distributed amongst the other tasks/requests based on their fixed priority).

65. Regarding Rajkumar, Applicant argues on pg 20 of Remarks:

"Applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner did not satisfy his burden of establishing that the claimed elements of independent claims 39 and 74 (and the claims depending therefrom) - including "determining whether a sufficient amount of unallocated computing resources are available to fulfill all of said one or more requests" or using the method on "a distributed computer system" - are obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The Examiner merely supplied Applicants with conclusory statements of obviousness and, therefore, the Examiner's rejection lacks the necessary factual foundation to meet his burden of establishing obviousness (as described in MPEP § 2141)."

66. Examiner disagrees. As indicated previously, Rajkumar is directed towards allocated resources amongst the reservation requests and other fixed priority tasks ([0023-24]). While not explicitly disclosed in Rajkumar, the step of determining whether a sufficient amount of unallocated resource is available to fulfill all of the requests is obvious in light of the prior art. Rajkumar recites, "the present invention specifically seeks to provide guaranteed and timely processing for real-time applications that require or expect to be provided access to resources not only on a reservation basis, but also on a fixed-priority basis" ([0022]). Therefore, a determination step to determine the availability of resources to handle all pending requests would be obvious since Rajkumar seeks to provide timely processing to all tasks.

67. The use of distributed computer systems is widely known in the prior art. However, as evidence of such is requested by Applicant, the Examiner submits that use

of a distributed computer system can be found in references such as Liu (US Pat No. 5,031,089).

68. Regarding Rajkumar Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar, Applicant argues on pg 22 of Remarks:

"The Examiner's reasoning for combining Rajkumar with Buyya - i.e., motivation "by the desire to increase revenue as a result of competition" - does not adequately explain why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention would think to combine a patent application directed to managing tasks run in an operating system (Rajkumar) with a publication concerning an economy grid architecture for service oriented grid computing (Buyya). In other words, the Examiner has not established why and how a "desire to increase revenue as a result of competition" would convince one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Rajkumar with Buyya to achieve the claimed subject matter (without using impermissible hindsight)."

69. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Rajkumar

teaches a system for allocation resources based on reservation and requests for such resources. Buyya is concerned with an economy grid architecture for service oriented grid computing. Buyya is also heavily concerned with maximizing profit and resource utilization. Such concepts can be applied to any computer system, such as taught by Rajkumar, since such motivation is clearly provided by Buyya (pg 2 col 2, paragraph 2).

70. Regarding Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar, Applicant argues on pg 23 of Remarks:

"Here, the Examiner gives no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have reason to combine Ahamed with Rajkumar or any of the other cited references. The Examiner merely noted that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a distributed computer system composed of differing processing capabilities in order to reduce system costs."

71. Examiner disagrees. The motivation to combine Ahamed with Rajkumar was clearly stated in Ahamed and above, namely, reducing system costs. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize that computer hardware equipment can become prohibitively expensive. The knowledge available to one of ordinary skill and further supported by Ahamed indicates that reducing system costs is proper motivation for the combination of the two references.

72. Regarding Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar, Applicant argues on pg 23 of Remarks:

"Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Examiner has not provided any express reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would have thought to combine the cited references. Rather, the Examiner has provided what appears to be impermissible hindsight by merely stating A covers X and B covers Y, so it would have been obvious to combine A and B because one would want to implement X with Y. For example, the Examiner states that combining Rajkumar with Buyya would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art "in order to implement a computational economy". Non-final Office action ¶ 14, p.6. However, the Examiner does not state how and why one of ordinary skill in the art (whom was not described) at the time of the invention would find it obvious to combine each of the specific four references cited by the Examiner in order to develop the claimed subject matter."

73. Examiner disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

74. Regarding Rajkumar, Buyya, Ahamed, and Tayyar, Applicant argues on pg 24 of Remarks:

"Moreover, there is no language or teachings within the cited references to give one of ordinary skill in the art any reason to combine those references. In other words, the statements the Examiner provides as purported reasons to combine the references, do not give reasons for one of ordinary skill in the art to read the references (at the time the invention was made) and develop the Applicants' solutions to the problems in the prior art as claimed herein."

75. Examiner disagrees. As argued above, the motivation required for combining the cited references was properly provided and found within the references themselves. To summarize, Rajkumar teaches an allocation of resources to reservation requests and fixed priority tasks. Buyya teaches a computation economy to maximize profit and resource utilization out of computer systems. Ahamed teaches a method of mixing processor capabilities in a computer system to reduce system cost. It is clear that one of ordinary skill would read the cited prior art to improve upon Rajkumar to make the modifications and changes to increase profits and reduce costs.

Conclusion

76. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

77. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric C. Wai whose telephone number is 571-270-1012. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng - Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Eric C Wai/
Examiner, Art Unit 2195

